REPORT RESUMES

ED 014 511 UD 004 076

PROCEEDINGS OF THE INVITATIONAL CONFERENCE ON NORTHERN SCHOOL DESEGREGATION--PROGRESS AND PROBLEMS (NEW YORK CITY, APRIL 29, 1962).

YESHIVA UNIV., NEW YORK, N.Y., GRAD. SCH. OF EDUC.

PUB DATE 29 APR 62

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$2.44 59P.

DESCRIPTORS- *CONFERENCES, *NORTHERN SCHOOLS, *SCHOOL INTEGRATION, BOARD OF EDUCATION POLICY, SCHOOL SYSTEMS, DEFACTO SEGREGATION, SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION, EDUCATIONAL RETARDATION, MINORITY GROUP CHILDREN, OPEN ENROLLMENT, INTEGRATION METHODS, TRANSFER POLICY, COURT LITIGATION, EDUCATIONAL EQUALITY, ENRICHMENT PROGRAMS, REMEDIAL PROGRAMS, NEW YORK CITY COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS, HIGHER HORIZONS, PROJECT BEACON, NEW YORK CITY,

THESE PROCEEDINGS ARE OPENED BY A WELCOMING STATEMENT BY JOSHUA A. FISHMAN, WHICH IS FOLLOWED BY A DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT BEACON OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION OF YESHIVA UNIVERSITY. THE PAPERS PRESENTED ARE (1) AN INTRODUCTION BY STANLEY H. LOWELL, (2) "SHALL SCHOOL BOARDS BE COLOR-BLIND OR COLOR-CONSCIOUS," BY WILL MASLOW, (3) "PROGRESS AND PROBLEMS FROM THE SOCIAL SCIENTIST'S VIEWPOINT," BY KENNETH B. CLARK, (4) "PROGRESS AND PROBLEMS FROM THE EDUCATOR'S VIEWPOINT," BY FRANCIS A. TURNER, AND (5) "WHAT CAN BE DONE TO REDUCE ACADEMIC RETARDATION IN MINORITY GROUP CHILDREN," BY DANIEL SCHREIBER. (NH)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

04076

ED014511

Proceedings of
Invitational
Conference
On

NORTHERN SCHOOL DESEGREGATION: PROGRESS AND PROBLEMS

Sunday, April 29, 1962

Sponsored in honor of the
Seventy-fifth Anniversary of
Yeshiva University

available

UD004076

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION • YESHIVA UNIVERSITY
110 WEST 57TH STREET, NEW YORK 19, N. Y. • JUdson 2-5260

Leadership Through Excellence

PROCEEDINGS

of the

INVITATIONAL CONFERENCE

on

NORTHERN SCHOOL DESEGREGATION: PROGRESS AND PROBLEMS

April 29, 1962

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
YESHIVA UNIVERSITY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Welcoming Remarks — Page 3
Dr. Joshua A. Fishman, Dean and Professor of Psychology, Graduate School of Education, Yeshiva University

Project Beacon — 6

Introduction — 11
Mr. Stanley H. Lowell, Chairman
New York City Commission on Human Rights
80 Lafayette St
New York, N.Y.
04077
F510911503

Shall School Boards be Color-Blind or Color-Conscious — 17
Mr. Will Maslow, National Executive Director
American Jewish Congress
15 E 84
04078
F5103

Progress and Problems from the Social Scientist's Viewpoint — 24
Dr. Kenneth B. Clark, Professor of Psychology
University of the City of New York
535 E 80 St.
New York, N.Y.
04079
F510911503

Progress and Problems from the Educator's Viewpoint — 31
Mr. Francis A. Turner, Assistant Superintendent
New York City Board of Education
04080
F 5103909511

What Can be Done to Reduce Academic Retardation in Minority Group Children — 46
Mr. Daniel Schreiber, Director
School Dropout Project, National Education Association, Washington, D.C.
04081
F 609511HH:
31077

Post Scriptum — 57

Leadership Through Excellence

WELCOMING REMARKS

Dr. Joshua A. Fishman
Dean and Professor of Psychology
Graduate School of Education
Yeshiva University

On behalf of the Graduate School of Education it is my pleasure to welcome all of you to this Invitational Conference which is part of our celebration of Yeshiva University's 75th Anniversary. As many of you may know, these have been our temporary quarters since this School was established just five years ago. They will remain our quarters for another three to five years until the University's new Midtown Campus is completed and ready for occupancy. Until that time, our space here is limited and, although we planned today's Conference for a small and carefully selected group of highly interested and involved participants we are, nevertheless, a little crowded here this afternoon. However, this is due not only to our limited quarters but also to the fact that somewhat more of you accepted our invitations than we had dared hope. We write this down to the importance of the topic we are met here to discuss, as well as to the seriousness of your involvement in the issues which it has generated. As I look about and note the school superintendents, the editors and journalists, the leaders of parent and community groups, the social scientists and educators in attendance here this afternoon, I do not at all regret that we are somewhat cramped for lack of space. I am tremendously gratified by your presence. I assure you that cramped as we are, there is plenty of room here for important ideas and for creative points of view, and I welcome you for the express purpose of pursuing such ideas and points of view.

The Graduate School of Education has commemorated Yeshiva University's seventy-fifth anniversary throughout this entire academic year by means of a series of lectures by distinguished visitors. The topics of these lectures were as follows: (a) Recent Attacks on New York City Education, (b) Contributions of Anthropology to Urban Education, (c) Peace Corps, Foreign and Domestic, (d) The Training of Teachers for Culturally Deprived Area Schools, and (e) Curricular Revision and Enrichment for Culturally Deprived Children. I mention these topics to you in the hope that you will recognize that the theme of our Invitational Conference this afternoon is no mere accident. We have selected the topic of Northern School Desegregation for our Conference this year because we consider it one of the major social and educational problems of our country and because we believe that it is our duty at the Graduate School of Education to contribute to the solution of such problems.

Our earlier lectures this year, this Conference, and many other projects and programs in which we are currently engaged are all related to each other in that they all seek to grapple with important social-educational issues - rather than to look away from them in academic, Olympian detachment. If you will examine the materials in your conference packets you will notice, I am sure, many items that will substantiate this claim. Permit me to refer to only one of these: the statement on "Beacons for Educational Leadership". This statement deals with our pre-service and in-service training and re-training program for educational personnel (teachers, administrators, guidance specialists and others) in culturally deprived metropolitan areas. We are beginning this program in a modest fashion this summer; we expect to expand it somewhat in the Fall; and we hope to see it grow and contribute to the solution of educational problems for which educational personnel are currently seldom prepared. I believe that you will be hearing a great deal about our Project Beacon as time goes by.

I have mentioned our lecture series and our Project Beacon in order to stress that the Graduate School of Education considers itself to be the natural home for this afternoon's Conference and for similar conferences in the future. We are a small school in cramped quarters on a noisy city street, but we hope that this merely makes us at the Graduate School of Education more receptive to the problems of teachers, parents and children working in much more cramped quarters and under much more undesirable circumstances in large cities throughout the length and breadth of this country. These children and these teachers face extremely serious - even heartbreaking - problems and, therefore, in welcoming you to this Conference let me express the hope that you will not merely exchange liberal sentiments, but that you will help each other with ideas, with suggestions, and with guides to action.

The problems of educational desegregation, the problems of education in culturally deprived areas and the educational problems of our great cities - these are all interrelated with each other. Progress in connection with one is also progress in connection with the others. We meet here today on some of the most serious educational and social issues of the age in the hope that we can be of help to each other in connection with them. In this day and age, every major social problem has its educational counterpart and every educational problem has its social roots. That is why we must come together - educators, social scientists and community leaders - in order to seek solutions to the problems that plague school and society alike.

It is now my pleasure to turn this Conference over to your Chairman, the Honorable Stanley H. Lowell, Chairman of the New York City Commission on Human Rights.

PROJECT BEACON

Announcing a program for:

- Teachers
- Educational Researchers
- Administrators
- Supervisors
- Guidance Workers
- Special Educators
- Curriculum Coordinators

NEW CAREER HORIZONS PLUS VALUABLE CONTRIBUTIONS TO SOCIETY

Graduate School of Education
Yeshiva University
110 West 57th Street
New York 19, New York
Judson 2-5260

BEACONS FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

An alarming proportion of American children and youth are growing up in deprived and socially disorganized surroundings. These deprivations are reflected in lower educational achievement. We cannot afford to waste the educational potential of so much of our population. Such waste is repugnant to our democratic ideals and counter to our "national interest" on The World Scene.

Disadvantaged communities -- in New York, in Philadelphia, in Chicago, in Detroit, in Los Angeles, and elsewhere -- offer challenges to enthusiasm and altruism similar to those found in the underdeveloped areas of the world served by the Peace Corps. These communities also offer valuable training possibilities analogous to those that a physician gets in a hospital, or a lawyer in litigation.

Not enough candidates of quality enter education because many young people do not see the full career possibilities of teaching. They feel that the profession may be too circumscribing and does not offer enough in status and salary. The many leadership opportunities in education -- in school curriculum, administration, supervision, guidance, testing and research -- should be made known to a larger audience.

In addition, many highly competent teachers seek professional and career extensions of classroom teaching in new and more challenging approaches to education and to the educational difficulties of culturally deprived areas throughout our country and throughout the world.

Teacher training institutions throughout the nation rarely acknowledge that significant field experiences for their training programs can be obtained in the disadvantaged community and among disadvantaged children. In order to contribute to the improvement of the educational level of these communities as well as to the improvement of training educational personnel, Yeshiva University Graduate School of Education seeks to train well motivated profession cadres for career responsibilities in disadvantaged communities.

Through its Project Beacon, the Graduate School of Education will bring together: (a) in-service educational personnel working in the culturally deprived areas of New York and other major metropolitan areas; (b) pre-service personnel seeking preparation for assignments to such areas, and (c) the faculty and resource consultants of the Graduate School of Education.

In-service personnel will be licensed teachers and administrators who are training for advanced professional opportunities and responsibilities. While maintaining their current teaching and administrative assignments in culturally deprived areas, they will be taking course work at the Graduate School of Education leading to higher degrees and professional specialization. Their rich experience will be utilized as well as extended via Project Beacon programs.

Pre-service personnel will be selected from qualified liberal arts graduates, studying under partial stipend, during most of their period of training preparing for teaching licenses and certificates and for subsequent leadership in any of the educational specialties.

Field experiences are especially important in Project Beacon,and much care has been given to their organization, their sequence, and their evaluation.

First, these field experiences will generally be in disadvantaged areas. They will include close contact with the agencies and institutions in their areas, such as Y's, housing bureaus and real estate firms, banks, newspapers, hospitals and clinics, civil rights organizations, unions, welfare, relief, and social work groups, playground and recreational facilities, unemployment insurance offices, religious and educational agencies.

Second, these field experiences will be reflected and further developed in course work and in research projects undertaken at the Graduate School of Education. Even a course like the History of Education, at first glance remote from the needs of children in disadvantaged areas, will derive its course materials in part from field experiences, as well as from relevant readings. Field work will contribute to comparisons between Plato's views on vocational education and the views on vocational education in Booker T. Washington's writings and in Conant's Slums and Suburbs. Field work will also contribute to inquiry into the vital effect of cultural values and traditions -- or their absence -- on educational outcomes. More obviously relevant to an integration of (a) field experiences, (b)course work and (c) research projects are such areas as Educational Psychology, Educational Sociology, Administration and Supervision, as well as methods courses whose contents are derived from psychological and sociological analyses of the deprived area child, his family, his neighborhood and his school.

Third, the very demands of field experiences in the disadvantaged area will screen unsuitable candidates and assure the professional orientation and purposefulness so necessary to success in the program.

Finally, field experiences of the kind described above will assure that the program has not only a training function, but is also a means of augmenting the reservoir of trained, competent personnel who are dedicated to improving life in the disadvantaged area, who see opportunities for professional growth in such areas, who will see the characteristics of these communities as physicians see health and illness -- as the proper area and arena of their life work. These field experiences will therefore be therapeutic for the community and didactic for the candidate.

The teacher training departments of the Graduate School of Education believe that institutions of learning should contribute more effectively to public policy and decision-making. Project Beacon expresses this belief. The faculty of the Graduate School of Education wishes to intensify, refine, and extend the work of programs like "Higher Horizons", to utilize its creative and scholarly facilities for the educational improvement of children in disadvantaged areas, as well as for the professional growth and leadership of school personnel in these areas.

To this end, the GSE intends to recruit candidates of the highest possible quality from among those currently in education, from among those who plan a career in education, and from among those who have thus far avoided an educational career because they have considered this field more limiting than careers in other professions in business or in industry. The GSE is going forth to these groups, and particularly to the last, in the conviction that advanced careers in education should and do have as much meaningfulness, financial reward, and challenge as do most other careers. Intensive recruiting across the nation for the best possible students is an intrinsic part of the leadership program of Project Beacon.

Affecting public policy requires affecting public opinion. Project Beacon plans on improving educational achievement levels in culturally deprived areas; it plans on training its educational cadres there, on the site; it plans on preparing a new kind of educational leader and educational specialist; it expects to bring these plans to the widest possible public and to seek support for them from all interested parties -- both governmental and private.

For additional news of Project Beacon as it develops, and for information concerning stipends and admission to the program, write:

Project Beacon
Graduate School of Education
Yeshiva University
110 West 57th Street
New York 19, New York

Northern School Desegregation

~~INTRODUCTION~~

Mr. Stanley H. Lowell, Chairman
New York City Commission on Human Rights

I am privileged to chair the panel on "Northern School Desegregation" on this occasion of the 75th anniversary of the founding of Yeshiva University.

will address myself briefly to four aspects of this timely subject: First, let us look at the dimensions of the problem of segregated schooling as it affects us in the North ...Second, let us touch upon the relationship between the northern and southern aspects of this problem...Third, let us consider the moral value at the root of the problem... And, finally, let us examine the reason why it is especially fitting for such a discussion to take place at Yeshiva University.

The words of your great president, Dr. Samuel Belkin, suggest our point of departure. For it was he who said that, "Knowledge is important, not only for the continuance of our cultural heritage, but for the preservation of life itself. Recognition of the moral law is of paramount importance for the survival of life itself".

It was moral law, in great measure, that led to the founding on Bill of Rights Day in December, 1955 of the Commission on Human Rights (then known as COIR). With Major Robert F. Wagner's strong support, the City Council in that year enacted Local Law 55, possibly the nation's most comprehensive human rights statute. Briefly, the law charged the Commission to eliminate discrimination whether it was practiced consciously or accidentally by public agencies, private corporations, groups or individuals.

The reasons for the passage of such a law in New York City are quite obvious. In many ways we lead the nation ...and the world. But we also have our problems, among them intolerance, bigotry, discrimination and segregation. You might call ours "accidental segregation" or, as we in the legal profession refer to it, de facto segregation. It is against the law...against public policy, but it still lingers on.

The establishment of the Commission on Human Rights--

throwing the full weight of policy and law behind anti-bias programs and policies--marked one turning point in our history. Now we are about to enter the next phase. It is quite possible that the time has come for a careful reexamination of our traditional concepts in the much-discussed areas of equality and integration--a reexamination which would carry us beyond theoretical promises to living realities.

In the City of New York, the Commission, other public agencies, many private organizations and such splendid educational institutions as yours have succeeded in reshaping the public's mind. Today bias is unfashionable. We should follow up on this advantage. We should use this time to plan and execute concrete action programs which would channel this new thinking in positive directions.

A look at the Census figures tells us that almost half (48 per cent actually) of the 18 million Negroes in this country now live outside the 11 states which once-formed... and sometimes act is if they are still a part of the Confederacy. According to the 1960 Census figures, New York City alone has 1,087,000 Negro citizens. Taking New York, Chicago, Philadelphia and Detroit, each contains a larger Negro population than any of the largest southern cities including New Orleans, Houston, Atlanta, Memphis or Dallas.

Like others who came to this country before them, Negroes came North seeking better opportunities. And, in many instances, they did improve their lot. But problems remained and other problems, mainly in the creation of ghetto housing, arose. In spite of the combined efforts of many men of goodwill and in spite of the heartwarming and striking instances of individual progress, the pace of integration in housing has been slow. There are many reasons.

High among them is the barrier to the Negro's economic progress, which prevents much real movement...and we at the Commission have confirmed this since passage of the historic Sharkey-Brown-Isaacs (Fair Housing Practices) Law some four years ago. Secondly, while many white persons are more than tolerant, most have not as yet reached the point where they work actively to create integrated housing situations. The result, we all know, is segregated schooling and it can be just as real whether it is _de facto_ or _de jure_.

A report issued by the Central Zoning Unit of the Board of Education in January of this year points up the seriousness of this problem. It showed that 102 out of

573 elementary schools in New York City were predominantly Negro or Puerto Rican. I won't belabor the point: facilities in these schools are often inferior to those available at predominantly white schools. As a part of the vicious circle, inequality is almost built-in...because Negro residential areas coincide with slum districts and old buildings can be expected to have obsolete facilities.

Segregated schools in our city were outlawed long before the United States Supreme Court's historic decision of May 17, 1954. We eliminated them, legally, in 1920. But many years later, Negro parents still found it necessary to petition the Board of Education in an attempt to correct obvious injustices.

In December of 1954, the Board of Education officially recognized that something had to be done. It acknowledged that segregated, racially homogeneous schools damage the personalities of minority group children, decrease motivation and impair their ability to learn (whether they happen to live in the North or in the South). Significantly, the Board added, "white children are also damaged...public school education in a racially homogeneous setting is socially unrealistic and blocks the attainment of the goals of democratic education, whether this segregation occurs by law or by fact".

The New York State Board of Regents made a similar statement in 1960, so that both the City and State were unanimous in suggesting that education should be "color conscious" rather than "color blind". But a declaration of policy is one thing, and actual achievement is another. And, this again, is where the Commission on Human Rights enters into the picture.

Reflecting enlightened educational attitudes as well as deep-seated community feelings, the Commission urged the Board of Education to adopt a seven-point program designed to translate policy statements into realities.

Very briefly, the Commission recommended high-level direction and staffing of a school integration program... the assignment of qualified teachers to schools with large minority group populations...in-service training programs ...expanded efforts to build community understanding...the use of school site selection policies to advance integration. And the Commission made another recommendation. It urged the adoption of a policy that we have since come to know as "open enrollment".

Today, open enrollment is one of the most tangible expressions of our city's official "open city" policy. On January 8th, the Board of Education reported that nearly 5,000 elementary and junior high school pupils were attending 127 schools outside their neighborhoods, under this program.

On April 5th of this month, the Board announced the further assignment of 3,591 pupils to open enrollment schools for next September. A total of 105 schools in all boroughs except Staten Island have been selected as receiving schools.

There is much more to the story of open enrollment. One aspect involves sheer numbers:

Some would ask whether New York City can really integrate its schools. Three-fourths of the children in public elementary schools in Manhattan are either Negro or Puerto Rican. In the city as a whole, 40 per cent are from these two groups. And the latest figures suggest that the percentages may be going up. In 1957, for example, there were 64 elementary schools in which the Negro-Puerto Rican enrollment exceeded 90 per cent. By January of this year, the number had increased to 102 -- constituting about 17.8 per cent of all the city's public elementary schools as a result of declining white enrollments.

On the other side of the ledger, all-white elementary schools decreased from 209 in 1957 to 217 in January of this year. But figures alone do not give us the full picture. We should know...all of us, that is...precisely where we are going and why. We should plan and act on the basis of understanding and objectives.

School desegregation under open enrollment has been positive and dynamic, but we must give serious thought to the next phase of the North's attack on school segregation. And we must clear away the cobwebs of misinformation and fuzzy thinking. How many people realize that:

1. School desegregation and integration are not identical.

2. Integration should involve specific school administrative approaches (e.g., curriculum changes and new teaching methods) and it should rest firmly on a foundation which recognizes the dynamics of social and psychological classroom activity. In other words, it requires changes -- geared to the most up-to-date thinking in both methods and approach.

3. And further that this total educational process should provide the tools, techniques and motivation for integrated extra-school, adult living.

Our actions here in New York...the situation recently spotlighted in New Rochelle...and the accelerated pace of activity in New Jersey, in Ohio, in Detroit, in Chicago and on the West Coast demolish the remnants of the myth that this is solely a southern problem. It is a national problem without doubt. But there are differences of degree. Progress in this field might be measured this way: First comes the elimination of legal segregation. Next there is movement toward desegregation. And, finally, there is the attainment of integration.

The South, in many instances, is at Step 1 on the way to Step 2...it is eliminating legal segregation and moving toward desegregation. The North, in many instances, is at Step 2 on the way to Step 3. In other words, it is moving...somewhat unsurely...from desegregation toward integration.

As I indicated earlier, we have found at the Commission on Human Rights that bias is becoming unfashionable in our city. And it would not be stretching a point to suggest that it was about time.

Men of vision have proclaimed for centuries that equality was or should be the base of man's relations with his fellows. This concept -- social justice -- is the keystone of the Judaic-Christain ethic.

The major social chord which the Hebrew prophets kept vibrating was justice. In its various usages, it meant order, law, right, legal right. The concept of social democracy developed hand in hand with the evolution of the idea of one God. And this principle, activated through love, is Christianity's major chord, its gift to social ethics.

Today, with the principles having been firmly established and with a degree of acceptance having been won, we must hold the warmth and dignity of this promise and move unfalteringly ahead a step or two. Now the time has come to make integration a cardinal principle in our modern democratic concept. We must strive to make integration one of the norms in our culture. And, having done so, we need not fear that whites as well as Negroes will be desirous of striving for it.

It is at this point in our development and in our thinking that the Commission needs understanding and assistance. Helpful suggestions will come from members of this panel, I am sure. Educators, generally, can play a vital role -- and Yeshiva University symbolizes this new kind of educational mission. This, as Dr. Belkin has so aptly phrased it, is "the higher moral purpose of education...".

This kind of education will continue to point the way to action.

Chairman:

We had a little bit of a discussion a few minutes ago as to who comes first - not who comes first, the chicken or the egg - but who comes first among the speakers. We decided that even if we somewhat overlapped from time to time in the papers and discussions which we are bringing to you, it would be best to proceed from the more general to the more specific, from papers that deal with the country at large to papers that focus on a single city or on a single project.

I am pleased to present, as the first speaker, the very effective national executive director of a very effective national organization, Mr. Will Maslow of the American Jewish Congress. Mr. Maslow's topic is "Shall School Boards be Color-Blind or Color-Conscious?".

SHALL SCHOOL BOARDS BE COLOR-BLIND OR COLOR-CONSCIOUS?

Mr. Will Maslow, National Executive Director
American Jewish Congress

I want to dwell a moment on the two terms that Mr. Lowell used in describing this problem: *de jure* segregation and *de facto* segregation. The distinction is important because different legal implications flow from the two terms. By *de jure* segregation we mean a system of contrived segregation - contrived by public officials. Now, it may be contrived as it has been in the South by a state law; it may be contrived by a resolution of a board of education, or it may be contrived "under the table" by means of one or another of a variety of devices, without a formal declaration of policy. But all of these contrivances are designed either to increase or decrease the Negro or Puerto Rican percentage of a school or of a school district. *De facto* segregation is a system whereby you have an excessive concentration of minority group children in a particular school without any deliberate policy by an official body. This concentration may result from the bias of local landlords or of local real estate boards, but it is not the result of a policy for which the board of education or any public official has any responsibility. Now, up to this time, the courts have held that there is no legal responsibility for any school board to do anything about *de facto* segregation. The New Rochelle case is not an exception to that statement. In New Rochelle the court found, specifically, a policy of segregation contrived by the school board. As far as the direction the courts give us, they tell us that contrived policy is illegal but that de facto segregation is something that the court cannot command the school board to do anything about. If the school board wishes to do something about it, it does so out of its educational, as well as its moral responsibility, rather than out of any legal responsibility. This places a dilemma upon the school boards of the North. Shall they be, in the striking phrase of Plessy vs. Ferguson, "color-blind", and say, as does the city of Chicago, we are not responsible for the de facto segregation that arises from the black belt of Chicago and, therefore, we will do nothing about it. Chicago says, in effect: "We are unconcerned about the color or race of the children going to our schools; we keep no records of race, we have no estimates, this is not our problem. That is the problem of society". The opposite approach is that of New York City and New York State, which now say that de facto desegregation is educationally undesirable; that it is impossible to give a child a completely democratic education when he is in a situation where all of his classmates are of the same race. This is the "color-conscious" approach.

A city choses either the approach of New York or the approach of Chicago. San Francisco, as Mr. Lowell has mentioned, is going down the New York path. San Francisco has asked its superintendent of schools to make a survey of the racial situation and to come back with recommendations. In other words, it has assumed a moral responsibility. In Detroit, the board of education has appointed a Citizens Advisory Committee which, after two years of work, came back with a massive report describing widespread concentrations of Negro population and with a host of recommendations as to how to deal with this fact. On the other hand, Philadelphia is a city which, by and large, has accepted the "color-blind" approach. But there is one great difference in Philadelphia; Philadelphia has also always had the policy which we call "open enrollment". Namely, that any child, in any school district, can transfer to any other school provided the receiving school has room for him.

Segregation can be contrived in a variety of ways without adopting any formal resolution. You can do it first of all by gerrymandering districts. Improper site selection is another device for perpetuating segregation or creating it. In New Rochelle, for example, the school board persisted in relocating an obsolete and dilapidated school in the heart of a Negro area, in order to make sure that the new school would be occupied exclusively by Negroes. A third policy favoring segregation is the deliberate under-utilization or deliberate over-utilization of certain schools. In New Rochelle, the school board deliberately chose to erect on the site of the nearly all-Negro Lincoln School a very small new school which would house only 400 pupils, knowing that if it increased the capacity of the new school it would necessarily have to admit to it white children, as well. Thus, the board followed a policy of deliberate under-utilization to perpetuate a wholely Negro school. In Chicago, we have deliberate over-utilization of schools. Negro schools remain overcrowded on double shifts, white schools remain under-utilized on single time and the school board resists all effort to transfer Negro children from crowded schools to less crowded schools. A fourth method of promoting segregation is by an improper transfer policy. That was one of the chief means that Judge Kaufman found to have been used by the school board at New Rochelle to create, maintain, or perpetuate a predominantly all-Negro school, namely, allowing transfers out of the school district at one time and freezing them at another. And, finally, you can promote segregation by the arbitrary assignment of classes or grades to a particular school.

Now, let's look at the reverse of the situation. How do you go about desegregating a school system? I don't want to spend any time on the problems of the suburbs (where you have few Negroes), because I think they are relatively simple of solution. There are a variety of solutions, but they consist, in essence, of what is known as the Princeton Plan, because it was first started in Princeton, N.J. All of the children (Negro and white) in a given area go to one school for certain grades (say kindergarten to 3rd grade), and all of the children in the same area go to another school for other grades (say 4th grade to 6th grade). Thus, although one school may have originally been predominantly white and the other predominantly non-white, the result of the Princeton Plan is to wind up with two or more desegregated schools. However, when you get into a metropolitan area with an intense concentration of Negroes or Puerto Ricans, then your problems arise. (I ought to point out that school desegregation is by no means an exclusively Negro or Puerto Rican problem. In Los Angeles, they have schools that are almost completely Latin American. In San Francisco, they have schools that are completely Chinese or Japanese. So you can see the variety of minority groups involved.) Now, assuming that a city with a large Negro population and with many de facto segregated schools wanted to do something about the problem, I think all experts are agreed that it must first start by a declaration of policy. It must tell the community what it is doing and why it is doing it. This is how New York began in December, 1954 with a courageous statement, saying that desegregation is an educational responsibility. A second step, equally indispensable in my opinion, is the making of a racial census. Unless a school board knows how many Negroes there are in its various schools, it cannot effectively go further. Now, that doesn't mean that the school has to list the color or the race of the child on its school record, or that the child must be asked whether he is Negro or Puerto Rican. What New York has been doing now for several years is to have the teacher make estimates by head counts, without questioning the children. While the resulting figures may not be 100% precise or scientific, they are good enough for every practical purpose. The result is that New York now knows approximately how many Negroes or Puerto Ricans there are in every single class in the 600 or more schools of New York City. When Detroit began its two-year study, the first thing it did was to undertake a racial school census.

After you have obtained your census data and have issued your policy statement, what do you do next? The Commission on Integration, which was appointed by New York City's Board of Education in 1954, recommended three main approaches to the problem of desegregation. The first was to make integration one of the cardinal principles in zoning and, when practicable,to re-zone school districts, in order to promote integration. This doesn't have to result in arbitrary school district lines. The second method of reducing segregation is in the selection of a school site. If a school building is going to be located in Harlem, it is going to be impossible to bring about an integrated school. A school placed in the heart of a black belt is bound to remain completely segregated. A school placed in a fringe area has a chance of becoming an integrated school, provided that the neighborhood itself does not change. Now, this places a cruel dilemma upon the school administrator. Shall he continue to maintain the obsolete and dilapidated school buildings in the heart of the slum areas, buildings so old that they lack lunch rooms, lack gymnasiums, lack playground space; or shall he locate new buildings on the edge of a black belt in a fringe area, retaining the Jim Crow schools in the black belt? There are no easy answers to that problem. What New York City has done, I think, is to abandon completely the recommendation of the Commission of Integration that new schools shall be placed whenever possible in fringe areas. I do not say that they necessarily deserve censure for that. With more money available, it might, perhaps, be possible to do both things.

But if you are forced to choose between continuing schools which are nothing but hovels or putting new schools in fringe areas, I can't blame educational administrators for deciding that the hovels just have to be replaced by new schools in the very same neighborhoods.

The third main method of desegregation is what New York calls its "open enrollment" policy (which Philadelphia and Baltimore have always maintained), and that is to abandon the idea that a child must go to a school within his immediate neighborhood. New York has abandoned that and now allows children from so-called "sending schools" to go to "receiving schools" out of the neighborhood. Now these children are not allowed to attend the receiving schools selected on the basis of their race or color. No individual in New York City is being granted or denied a privilege of any kind in the school system because of race or color. In my opinion, if New York were to do that, it would not only be illegal, it would also be immoral and would probably, in the long run, be self-defeating. What New York school administrators are doing is selecting the "sending schools" only from among those schools in which Negroes and Puerto Ricans are 90% or more of the enrollment. As a result of its racial census, New York is able to identify these schools without any great difficulty. It then allows everyone in a "sending school", including the small number of continental whites, to transfer to a "receiving school" if he so wishes.

The "receiving schools" are chosen with two qualifications in mind. First of all, they must have a Negro-Puerto Rican population that is appreciably lower than the "sending schools" (otherwise nothing would be achieved by the whole operation). Secondly, they must have some extra room, otherwise the result might be to transfer children from a school where there is a single full-time session, to a school where there are two part-time sessions. The results of this program have been that some 5000 children in all have been transferred out of these segregated and double session "sending schools" into desegregated and single session "receiving schools".

Let us remember, however, that 44% of the elementary register in the City, as a whole, is Negro-Puerto Rican. You are not going to solve a problem of this magnitude, you are not going to eliminate segregation, by the "open enrollment" policy alone. Nevertheless, the policy has great symbolic value. It is at least a symbol of our striving for democratic equality.

There is another approach which is utilized in combating segregation in New York, which has not received much attention and which, I believe, is even more important than "open enrollment". In New York City, some 20,000 children on double time, that is, on a four hour part-time shift, have been transferred to other schools where they attend full-time. Most of the children attending part-time schools are Negro-Puerto Rican children. Transferring them to less crowded schools achieves two purposes: first of all, it removes a gross inequality in education and, secondly, it is much more effective in reducing the number of children going to segregated schools than anything else that New York City has yet come up with. Now, there is still a pool of 80,000 children in New York City, most of them Negroes and Puerto Ricans, still on a part-time schedule. If we would concentrate on these 80,000 children, we would achieve greater results in a much shorter period of time than we ever can achieve by permissive "open enrollment".

You must understand, also, that there are some educators who have doubts that the permissive enrollment policy is a wise policy on any score. They argue that what it does is merely to drain off from the school the best parents and the best children. Those parents who are most concerned about the education of their children, who are most likely to be the leaders of the PTA, are also most likely to have the brightest children in the school. The "open enrollment" policy drains off these children and leaves the school with much poorer human resources. Secondly, there are difficulties in persuading a parent that it is advantageous for his child to leave his own neighborhood and travel by bus to some distant area in order to find a school building that is under-utilized and desegregated. This is particularly difficult when the parent has two or more children attending a neighborhood school and then has to separate the siblings: one going to one school, and one going to another.

New York City started its integration program in 1957. The results today, while they would give New York City an A for effort, are far from giving New York City an A for the actual results achieved. When the program started, there were 64 elementary schools in New York City, with a Negro concentration of 90% or higher. Today, five years later, the number of such schools has increased to 102, an increase of 50%. New York City administrators seem to be trying to go down a rapidly ascending escalator. One reason for this great increase is that the number of Negroes and Puerto Ricans in many sections of New York continues to increase, and the number of continental whites continues to decline. New York

City has achieved practically nothing by redistricting schools.

I want to mention another major problem which I won't have time to go into at all, but which must be considered, while we grapple with the difficulties of desegregation, and that is the problem of the awful gap in the achievement level between children from slum areas and children from outside these areas. In 1955, a study by the Public Education Commission showed that there was almost a two year differential in reading levels between children in the eighth grade attending _de facto_ segregated schools and children attending a mixed school. After four years of special programs, the president of the board of education, in a public statement before a State legislative committee, testified that there are 177,000 children in New York City, who are more than two years behind in their reading level. I am not saying this because I think there was an easy solution which New York has overlooked. I am saying this to point out some of the inherent difficulties in the effort to desegregate a metropolitan area and to equalize education opportunities. This does not mean that New York City should abandon its desegregation programs; it doesn't mean that Conant was right when he said that nothing but token efforts at desegregation are possible. It means that New York City must redouble its efforts. Instead of the one and one-half million dollars that are being spent each year on Higher Horizons programs, we must begin to spend fifteen or thirty million dollars a year on such special programs. Instead of relying exclusively on "open enrollment", we have got to spend as much time on the overcrowded slum schools which "open enrollment" will hardly help. Unless New York City redoubles its efforts, the situation will grow worse year after year.

Chairman:

Thank you very much, Will Maslow. I would like to comment briefly on the last remark Will has made, that we should be spending $30,000,000 on a Higher Horizons program, by pointing up the fact that the whole problem of educational responsibility and the source of educations funds do not necessarily have to be solved by referring to the budget of the City of New York, or the budget of the State of New York, or the budget of the City of Detroit, or the budget of the State of Michigan. It is obviously the responsibility of the Federal Government to find these kinds of funds and make them available.

Chairman:

As all of you know, Dr. Kenneth B. Clark is Professor of Psychology of the University of the City of New York, and in this whole field of endeavor relative to desegregation and integration, I think if any one man can be said to have spearheaded discussion and action on this subject in the City of New York and in many parts of the country, that man is Dr. Clark. It is my pleasure to introduce him to you now to speak on the topic "Progress and Problems from the Social Scientist's Viewpoint".

PROGRESS AND PROBLEMS FROM THE SOCIAL SCIENTIST'S VIEWPOINT

Dr. Kenneth B. Clark, Professor of Psychology
University of the City of New York

It is ironic that the recent concern with the problems of Northern school desegregation emerged directly from the litigation which sought to eliminate legally enforced segregation in the public schools of southern and border states. When the lawyers of the NAACP decided in 1950 to challenge the Plessy vs. Ferguson "separate but equal" doctrine as applied to public education, they also decided to include in their legal attack on this doctrine the findings and testimony of social scientists in the attempt to convince the Federal courts that segregated education in itself was inferior and that equality was impossible with the fact of segregation.

The role of the social scientists in these public school desegregation cases was to demonstrate by their testimony, based upon the best available theory and findings, that segregated schools resulted in or was inevitably associated with educational and psychological damage to the Negro children who were required to attend such schools.

In addition to the general problems of the inequality of these segregated schools and their obvious inferiority in educational standards, facilities, plant, curriculum and equipment which, understandably, resulted in a marked retardation in the academic achievement of the children attending such schools, the nuclear psychological factor which appeared to dominate the total pattern of educational detriment associated with segregated schools was the factor of a deep and pervasive damage to the self-esteem of these children who were rejected and isolated in racially segregated schools. The United States Supreme Court in the Brown decision of May 17th, 1954 underscored the human, educational and legal significance of this damage to the self-esteem when it stated "to separate them from others of similar age and qualifications solely because of their race generates a feeling of inferiority as to their status in the community that may affect their hearts and minds in a way unlikely ever to be undone." The Court then concluded "we conclude that in the field of public education the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal".

This is not the appropriate time or place to reopen the arguments concerning whether the Court did or did not rely upon social science rather than law in arriving at this important decision. Nor is it relevant at this time to discuss the significance, the validity or objectivity of those social scientists who worked so closely with the lawyers of the NAACP at the trial and appellate level of these cases. The purpose of this paper is to examine the effect of this decision on the patterns of de facto segregation in northern communities. In pursuing this purpose, it is important to keep in mind the fact that the Brown decision specifically involved only those 17 states and the District of Columbia which had laws requiring or permitting racial segregation in public education. This decision did not deal directly with the problem of de facto segregation in northern communities. In fact, on the day following the Court's decision, a newspaper in a medium size northern urban community had a first page headline which simply stated "Decision does not mean us". The psychological significance of the guilt, anxiety and wish betrayed by this headline is obvious. What was not so obvious at the time was its inaccurate prophecy.

Two factors seem crucial in understanding how the Brown decision brought about re-examination of and changes in the patterns of de facto segregation in northern urban communities. First of these is the clarity and scope of the language of the Brown decision itself. Aside from pinpointing the damage to self-esteem which resulted from segregated education, the Court also discussed in most eloquent terms the significant functions of public education in preparing human beings for a successful and creative life in a Democracy. In highlighting this crucial role of education and demonstrating also the way in which segregated education impairs one's ability and motivation to learn, the Court stimulated serious thought about the effects of all types of segregated education on human beings - whether it be legal or de facto. It should be pointed out, however, that the Brown decision quoted a finding in the Kansas case which included the statement, "The impact is greater when it has the sanctions of the law; for the policy of separating the races is usually interpreted as denoting the inferiority of the Negro group". Certainly, the use of the comparative "greater" in the first part of that sentence suggests that segregation without the sanction of the law also has similar detrimental effects.

A second fact which must be recognized as having had some effect in calling attention to problems of de facto segregation in the North is the fact that many of the social scientists who worked with the lawyers of the NAACP in these school desegregation cases were from the North and were required to evaluate the conditions in their own communities, in the light of the testimony which they were giving about the effects of segregation in southern communities. For example, it was not possible to state that the patterns of public school segregation in South Caroline and Virginia had certain detrimental effects on those Negro children without being concerned about the possibility that Negro children attending segregated schools in Harlem were also being damaged by their segregated schools. In fact, one of the lawyers of the State of Virginia made it a point in cross-examining the social science expert witnesses on the side of the NAACP specifically on this issue. It was imperative, therefore, that the social scientists determine whether the effects of de facto segregation were different from, similar to, or identical with the effects of legally enforced public school segregation. A systematic examination of this problem in the New York City public schools revealed that the same pattern of educational and psychological detriment found among children attending legally segregated schools is found among Negro children attending de facto segregated schools in New York City. Negro children in New York City also had low self-esteem, low motivation and were severely retarded in academic achievement. These findings can be duplicated in every large urban community in which there are de facto segregated schools. The consistency of this finding required both remedial action on the part of concerned members of the community and further intensive and systematic study and action on the part of social scientists and educators.

Initially, the attack on the problem of de facto segregated schools in the North took the form of concentrated pressure on school boards and other political authorities in an attempt to get them to adopt policies and procedures which would decrease the number of existing segregated schools and prevent the development of new segregated schools. Developments in New York City within the past five years provide the best illustration of the partial effectiveness of this voluntary negotiation approach to the solution of this problem.

The Board of Education of the City of New York,as early as 1954, established a Commission on Integration to guide the Board and its professional staff in a systematic program of public school desegregation. The specific contributions of the program developed by the New York City Board of Education have become major guideposts to other northern communities who seek a solution to this complex problem with good faith. An analysis of the overall New York City program reveals that it can be broken down into two main parts. First, a program designed to increase the motivation and academic achievement of students in predominantly Negro schools. The Junior High School 43 Project and its successor, the Higher Horizons Program, are the products of this aspect of New York City's attack on this larger problem. The rationale of the Higher Horizons Program reflects the reality that the overwhelming majority of the children attending the public schools in the central city are at present minority group children. It follows, therefore, that an increasing proportion of the public schools will consist of minority group children if the population patterns continue the trend of the last fifteen years or so. The fact of predominantly minority group schools may therefore be one of the facts of urban life for the foreseeable future, unless the flight of middle class white groups to the suburbs can somehow be stemmed and reversed. Given this fact, therefore, it is imperative that some effective program designed to raise the educational standards, increase the motivation and the academic achievement of these children be developed and implemented.

The Higher Horizons Program pioneered by New York City is a first step in that direction. It must be intensified. The people of the City of New York must be made to recognize what a tremendously important and imperative demonstration of social engineering this program can be. The next step is for the Higher Horizons Program to be made an integral part of the general educational process in our public schools. In order to do this, it will be necessary to move this program beyond its present pilot, experimental, demonstration stage. The findings which are now available prove conclusively that with adequate stimulation, supervision and, above all, education these children can learn and can achieve in spite of poor homes and depressed community problems. There is no further need for continued experiments or demonstration projects. These findings must be translated into the normal day to day educational process. To do so, at least the following requirements must be met:

1) There must be adequate financing of our public schools which will make possible manageable class size, adequate facilities, books, educational materials, and competent teaching.

2) There must be competent supervision of the educational process.

3) There must be some system of accountability whereby teachers are evaluated and promoted on the basis of the academic performance of their students on standardized achievement tests.

When these and other standards essential for an effective educational process are instituted and enforced, the problem of an adequate education of minority group children in northern urban centers will be well on its way toward a successful and democratic solution.

There remains, however, the gnawing and disturbing question of whether even the best de facto segregated school with the highest educational standards and procedures can be an effective instrument in preparing American children for the world of tomorrow. This is essentially a complex social science question with many facets. To what extent does the very fact of the racially homogeneous school, consisting of children from lower status groups, inevitably lower the morale of their teachers, the self-esteem of the children, and the over-all perspective of their parents? This aspect of the problem has not yet been systematically examined by social scientists. It is imperative that future research obtain answers to these complex questions: In the meantime, it is necsary to develop programs designed to increase the number of children who have the opportunity for an education in non-segregated - racially heterogeneous schools.

The second aspect of the New York City program, the Open Enrollment Program, directs itself to the solution of this problem. The Open Enrollment Program is an important guidepost to a partial resolution of the problem of increasing the number of non-segregated schools in northern urban centers. The readiness of other urban areas to accept this model may be used as an index of the amount of good faith which is involved in their attempts at solving this aspect of the problem. It may be suggested, in spite of Mr. Conant's disagreement, that any Higher Horizons type program or Great Cities Program which does not include the Open Enrollment phase could be interpreted as an acceptance of the inevitability of segregated schools, if not as a contemporary version of continued gerrymandering, which means increasing and perpetuating such schools.

A most recent and significant development in the attack on the problem of segregated schools in the North has been the approach through the Courts. A number of years ago, Justice Justine Wise Polier handed down a decision which, in effect, stated that a Board of Education could not require Negro parents to send their children to segregated schools. This decision was not appealed and therefore did not reach the Federal Courts. Within the past year, Federal Judge Kaufman handed down the decision in the New Rochelle case which established the relevance of the _Brown_ decision to the problem of _de facto_ segregated schools in northern communities. The Kaufman decision must be recognized as an important bridge between the litigation dealing with the southern public school cases and the problem of northern _de facto_ segregated schools. Robert L. Carter, Chief Counsel of the NAACP, is now developing the legal rationale and approach to a series of cases which will be brought before the Federal Courts attacking the problem of _de facto_ segregation in northern urban communities. The first of these cases which will be presented to the Federal Courts, if necessary, is that dealing with segregated schools in Orange, New Jersey.

It would have been hoped that northern communities would not require a procedure of litigation in the attempt to resolve the problems of segregated schools. Indeed, some northern communities have voluntarily sought effective resolution of these problems without litigation. It is significant for the social scientists, however, and probably should be a subject of systematic research that a number of northern communities show the same patterns, intransigence, evasiveness, and double talk found when a southern community is confronted with the demands for the desegregation of their public schools. An additional and more difficult factor is found in the North, namely, the factor of self righteous denial of intentional segregation or prejudice. This argument is usually supported by the fact of the absence of laws requiring school segregation, but is contradicted by a history of gerrymandering or school site selection which leads inevitably to segregated schools; and it is further contradicted by the adamance with which attempts at the desegregation of these schools are resisted.

In conclusion, one might interpret the available evidence in regard to northern school desegregation as supporting both optimism based upon examples of real progress, and continued caution based upon the many examples of deep and persistent resistence. It continues to be the role of the social scientist to make available his findings and data toward the end of an effective, democratic and just resolution of these problems. Social scientists have the additional and parallel role of attempting to analyze and understand and hopefully reduce the persistent and subtle forms of resistence which seem so pervasive in the North.

Chairman:

The next speaker who has been wrestling with some of the problems just outlined by Will Maslow and Dr. Clark, a man that I knew and worked with when I was assistant to the Mayor of New York, is a man who is responsible to an important degree for achieving some of the results that we have achieved in this field and who knows the reasons why we haven't gone any further than we have. He is an Assistant Superintendent of Schools for the New York City Board of Education. I am pleased to present to you Mr. Francis A. Turner.

PROGRESS AND PROBLEMS FROM THE EDUCATOR'S VIEWPOINT

Mr. Francis A. Turner, Assistant Superintendent
New York City Board of Education

The words of the May 17, 1954 unanimous Supreme Court decision on public education ("We conclude that in the field of public education the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal") will live in history for being as important in their significance for the people of America as any conclusion this Court has ever reached.

The Board of Education of New York City had long operated on the principle that equal educational opportunity for all children, regardless of economic, national, religious or racial backgrounds is essential to the continuation of American democratic society. It interpreted the May 17 decision of the U.S. Supreme Court as a legal and moral reaffirmation of its own fundamental educational principles. In June 1954, when the charge was made that de facto segregation existed in New York City, this was, in effect, a challenge to the Board to re-examine the racial composition of its schools to see wherein they failed to meet the concept of "Equality of Education".

As a result of this challenge, a Commission on Integration was appointed. This was subdivided into the Subcommissions on Educational Stimulation and Placement, Educational Standards and Curriculum, Community Relations and

Information, Physical Plant and Maintenance, Teachers' Assignments and Personnel, and Zoning.

Only those who were on the 27 member Commission on Integration and its various subcommissions, the representatives of civic groups interested in public education, and the representatives of federated parents groups, have any appreciable notion of the amount of dedicated effort that went into the area surveys and the preparation of the Commission's reports. These efforts, and the driving force of the Board Members and the Superintendent of Schools, combined to refine the policy recommendations to the point of acceptability.

Before 1920, segregated schools were permitted in New York State. They were not declared illegal until that year. Since then, some schools in New York became segregated on a de facto basis because people of like ethnic backgrounds had clustered mainly in four large areas in the same number of boroughs.

Much of the housing in these areas had been discarded by other groups, and many of the schools, like the houses, were old. In some of these same sections, congested tenements had created crowded schools. So, by the happenstance of ghetto living, you had not only over-utilized schools, but schools composed mainly of Negro and Puerto Rican pupils, as well. The concentration of racial and ethnic minorities had created schools which were not completely in accord with the principles of equal educational opportunity for all children. Both majority and minority group children were therefore being subjected to the disadvantages of education in isolation.

To correct these situations to the degree possible in the face of the extensive areas in Manhattan, the Bronx, Brooklyn, and Queens in which racial minorities were living in segregated patterns - to integrate or desegregate as many schools as possible, to give more pupils the advantages to be gained from an education in schools with a varied ethnic composition, to build new schools where they were needed even in segregated neighborhoods, if they were to be for elementary grade children (but to furnish the special services and adequate teaching personnel, and to so equip and supply these schools that they would be second to none) - to achieve these things in a mammoth city like New York, was the herculean educational task which the Board of Education and the superintendents of schools set for themselves.

School Construction

Some progress has been made. The steps taken through June 1960 have been reported in "Toward Greater Opportunity - A Progress Report from the Superintendent of Schools to the Board of Education".

Since this report was issued, 13 new schools have been built in areas peopled largely by minority groups.

Sites have already been selected for several additional buildings, and 25 are planned for construction in these crowded areas, within the next three years.

Personnel

As to personnel, the expense budget for 1962 in the Elementary Division requested 105 guidance counselors; 77 were granted. 89 additional classes were requested for the junior guidance program; all of these were granted. 134 teachers for schools with special needs were requested, but none of these were granted. There was a request for 357 teachers for special service schools; the budget allowed 240. Instead of the 250 teachers initially requested for remedial reading, we received 273. We asked for 109 additional teachers for the non-English speaking child, and received 30. In addition, we received $1,903,000 for teacher-aid employment towards the 1,549,640 hours of such employment that were requested.

Among other requests, the junior high school 1962 expense budget called for:

132 additional positions for 44 special service schools; 116 were granted.

23 additional positions for Open Enrollment Schools; none were granted.

200 career guidance positions to cut back on junior high school dropouts; 65 were granted for September 1962 and 65 more for September 1963.

As yet, no decision has been reached concerning the requested 427,500 hours of teacher aids.

The high school 1962 expense budget requests include allocations for:

1266 additional teaching positions

491 positions to be used for helping children who have reading and speech handicaps

Teacher training programs

Improved guidance services

Extensions of the cooperative education and advanced placement programs

As yet, no decision has been reached concerning these requests.

The shortage of teachers is still felt in many schools. With the regularly appointed teacher index set at 75%, staffing difficult schools is still one of the unsolved problems, even with the partially successful efforts of the Assistant Superintendents Committee created to arrange for on street or other parking for teachers who live great distances from the difficult schools in which they work.

Zoning

Before the Commission on Integration was formed, and previous to the report of the Sub-Commission on Zoning - five criteria were used when a school zone was drawn: Safety, distance required to reach the school, the topographical conditions in the area, transportation facilities available and, as a determinant of the size of the area, the continuity of education afforded.

Now a sixth criterion - that of integration - was included, and it was recommended that "all members of the professional staff, especially those concerned with the location of schools, and the assignment of children, be instructed to seize every opportunity to implement this principle". *

Population Changes

The most effective procedures for integration in New York City schools, at least on the basis of the numbers

---

* Toward Integration In Our Schools, Final Report of the Commission on Integration, page 17.

involved, have been the Improved Utilization of School Buildings Program and the Open Enrollment Program. Although the re-zoning of schools and site selection have had some effect on integration, open enrollment and a more balanced use of school space are the means through which the Central Zoning Unit has counteracted to a degree the effects of extensive changes in school populations (involving the loss of "others" and the increase of the Negro and Puerto Rican populations) over the last five years.

Let us look at these changes in school population.

The increase in the Negro and Puerto Rican population has been almost entirely in the areas of early concentration of Negro and Puerto Rican families. These families have moved into areas which were either already saturated or were on the fringes of the saturated areas. It is this heavy population tide with which New York City school integration policies and practices must contend. The tide has been strong enough to negate some of the progress made.

For example, there were 227,933 Negro and Puerto Rican elementary school pupils on register in 1959. By 1960, the number had increased by 14,941 to a total of 242,874. By 1961, the number had increased by an additional 14,094 to a total of 256,968. Total gain in two years - 29,035.

In the same period, there was a noticeable change in the registers of "others" in elementary schools.

In 1959, there were 329,222 "others" on register. By 1960, it had dropped to 324,739, a loss of 4,483. By 1961, it had dropped to 316,154, a loss of another 8,585. Total loss in two years - 13,068.

Equally significant is the fact that these population changes were not spread over the entire city but, rather, were concentrated in specific sections of Manhattan, the Bronx, Brooklyn and Queens. For example, in the borough of Manhattan, there were 101,755 pupils on register in elementary schools in 1959: 75,334 were Negro and Puerto Rican, 26,421 were "others". In 1960, there was an increase of 1,280 Negro and Puerto Rican pupils and a loss of 1,104 "others". By November 1961, there had been a further increase of 600 Negro and Puerto Rican pupils, and a loss of 977 "others".

In these two years, we were faced with an increase of 1,880 Negro and Puerto Rican youngsters in Manhattan alone,

THE PROBLEM OF PUPIL GROWTH

A. ELEMENTARY SCHOOL POPULATION

	N & P.R.	"X" Schools	"Y" Schools	Mid-Range	Total
1960	242,874 - 42.8%	(20%) (113,691)	(.8%) (4,598)	(21.9%) (124,585)	567,613
1961	256,968 - 44.8%	(21.5%) (123,239)	(.9%) (4,912)	(22.5%) (128,817)	573,122

	"Others"	"X" Schools	"Y" Schools	Mid-Range	Total
1960	324,739 - 57.2%	(.8%) (4,280)	(35.4%) (200,850)	(21.1%) (119,609)	567,613
1961	316,154 - 55.1%	(.8%) (4,322)	(32.0%) (183,396)	(22.4%) (128,436)	573,122

B. JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL POPULATION

	N & P.R	"X" Schools	"Y" Schools	Mid-Range	Total
1960	72,120 - 38.9%	(16.8%) (31,138)	(1.7%) (3,161)	(20.4%) (37,821)	185,479
1961	77,981 - 41.9%	(20.3%) (37,865)	(2.0%) (3,815)	(19.5%) (36,301)	186,113

	"Others"	"X" Schools	"Y" Schools	Mid-Range	Total
1960	113,359 - 61.1%	(1.1%) (2,016)	(40.4%) (74,913)	(19.6%) (36,430)	185,479
1961	108,132 - 58%	(1.5%) (2,796)	(34.2%) (63,578)	(22.4%) (41,758)	186,113

Data - Nov. 1961
Compiled - March 1962

"X" schools - Elementary Division - 90% +N and/or P.R.
"Y" schools - Elementary Division - 90% + "Others"
"X" schools - Junior High School Division 85% + N and/or P.R.
"Y" schools - Junior High School Division 85% + "Others"

THE PROBLEM OF PUPIL GROWTH

C. ACADEMIC HIGH SCHOOL POPULATION

	N & P.R.	"X" Schools	"Y" Schools	Mid-Range	Total
1960	30,029 - 15.9%	(0.5%) (853)	(2.8%) (5,204)	(12.7%) (23,972)	188,795
1961	33,184 - 16.7%	(0.4%) (795)	(2.7%) (5,347)	(13.6%) (27,042)	198,256

	"Others"	"X" Schools	"Y" Schools	Mid-Range	Total
1960	158,766 - 84.1%	(0.1%) (78)	(61.2%) (115,650)	(22.8%) (43,038)	188,795
1961	165,072 - 83.3%	(0.1%) (52)	(59.8%) (118,574)	(23.4%) (46,446)	198,256

D. VOCATIONAL HIGH SCHOOL POPULATION

	N & P.R.	"X" Schools	"Y" Schools	Mid-Range	Total
1960	16,842 - 43.5%	(2.5%) (974)	(1.4%) (540)	(39.6%) (15,328)	38,697
1961	18,563 - 45.8%	(2.6%) (1,039)	(1.3%) (540)	(41.9%) (16,984)	40,508

	"Others"	"X" Schools	"Y" Schools	Mid-Range	Total
1960	21,855 - 56.5%	(0.4%) (142)	(13.4%) (5,189)	(42.7%) (16,524)	38,697
1961	21,945 - 54.2%	(0.4%) (172)	(13.7%) (5,554)	(40.0%) (16,219)	40,508

Data - Nov. 1961
Compiled - April 1962

"X" schools - Academic High School - 85% +N and/or P.R.
"Y" schools - Academic High School - 85% +"Others"
"X" schools - Vocational High School - 85% +N and/or P.R.
"Y" schools - Vocational High School - 85% + "Others"

and a loss of 2,081 "others".

As might be suspected, the junior high school enrollment picture has been a similar one. There, the total enrollment city-wide dropped from 186,595 in 1959 to 185,479 in 1960, a loss of 1,116, and then rose by 634, taking it to 186,113 in 1961.

However, the number of Negro and Puerto Rican pupils increased from 65,880 in 1959 to 72,120 in 1960, a gain of 6,240, and rose again to 77,981 in 1961, a further gain of 5,861.

Now, let us take a look at the changes in the academic high school registration. In 1959, the register of all pupils in academic high schools stood at 189,737; in 1960, it was 188,795 - the loss, a comparatively slight one of 942 pupils. But in the same period, the total register of Negro and Puerto Rican pupils rose from 29,295 in 1959 to 30,029 in 1960, a gain of 734, while the register of "others" dropped from 160,478 in 1959 to 158,766 in 1960, a loss of 1,712.

By 1961, the Negro and Puerto Rican population in high schools increased to 33,184. In the same period, the "others" population rose to 165,072.

Transfers for Improved Utilization of School Facilities

Between 1957 and September 1959, the Central Zoning Unit and various assistant superintendents, transferred almost 28,000 pupils, mostly Negro and Puerto Rican, from crowded schools, in which four hours of instruction was given, to under-utilized schools, and a five hour school day. This is known as the Improved Utilization of School Facilities Program. Although the prime objective of this movement was a longer school day, in uncongested schools, a concomitant outcome was the opportunity for the pupils to benefit from the more stimulating experience of a desegregated education, for the thousands who were moved, as well as for the thousands of "others" in the schools to which they were sent.

By September 1961, another 19,800 pupils in 213 schools were re-zoned. Most of the latter school-to-school changes were effected by the revisions in school boundaries - a procedure which does not always lead to much improvement in desegregation, percentage-wise, but integration is never adversely affected. For 800 of these pupils, the changes were permissive, that is, parents were given the choice of having their children transferred to schools where there was less crowding. Boundary changes were not involved because the over-crowded and the under-utilized schools were not contiguous.

With respect to the almost 173,000 pupils (Negro, Puerto Rican and "others") still in "X" elementary schools in September 1961, in spite of the Improved Utilization of School Buildings Program, and because they choose not to leave their neighborhood schools, it appears that we are left with no alternative but that of providing in de facto segregated neighborhoods, buildings, services, supplies and teachers comparable to those found anywhere. Unless the housing pattern in New York City changes, we may always have "X" and "Y" schools.

Not to construct new buildings for elementary children in congested areas just because these facilities are certain to become "X" schools would be unrealistic, to say the least. At the same time, to deny parents the opportunities and benefits of an education in a school with a varied ethnic population, whenever this is possible, would be inconsistent with the policies of the New York City Board of Education.

To gradually strip a community of its educational facilities by not replacing the half century old buildings with new schools, even if it is not on a one for one basis, when this has to be done, would not only leave the community with no adequate facilities for the 9-3 educational program, but with no facilities for the 3-5 and the 7-10 recreational program for youngsters and teenagers, as well. It would also mean depriving these same communities of the brightly lighted and modern facilities for evening adult education programs which are demanded in those areas where adults are vocal and aware of the necessity for even the minimal opportunities for continuing their education beyond the elementary and high school level. It would deprive those neighborhoods which are in greatest need of adult education programs, that make it possible for people to keep their jobs and to participate as intelligent citizens in a government which can be no better than the educational level of its people. I do not refer to the needs of a comparatively few who come to the peaks as leaders, but to the broad supporting base of the so-called "ordinary" citizens who really are the foundations of democracy.

Open Enrollment

The second project that has enabled many youngsters to move into schools with a better ethnic balance is the Open Enrollment Program.

Briefly, this program, as it operates in the Elementary School Division, permits any pupil in grades 2, 3, and 4 of schools with 90% or above Negro and/or Puerto Rican population, or 90% or above "other", called "sending" schools, to submit applications to the Central Zoning Unit, for transfer to a "receiving" school with a utilization index of less than 90%, and a more equitably balanced ethnic population consisting of 75% and above "others".

A Pilot Program for K-1 classes of 12 "sending" schools permits any child in these classes to submit applications for transfer to "receiving" schools, where the ratio of "others" is 75% or above.

The number of pupils transferred to each school and to the grades of the school is controlled by the size of the registers in the "receiving" school, and the school's capacity.

On the grade level, the number of pupils assigned to a grade is never above two-thirds of the present register of the grade. The entering pupils are held by this means to 40 or 45% of the new register ("new register" being the sum of those attending the school from the neighborhood and the incoming pupils).

On the junior high school level, pupils in the sixth year of any elementary schools which normally feed junior high schools with 85% or above Negro and/or Puerto Rican population,may apply to the Unit for assignment to junior high schools with a more evenly balanced ethnic composition.

The Open Enrollment Program was initiated in the Fall of 1960 - as an experiment. At that time, 16 elementary schools were designated as "sending" schools, and 31 as "receiving" schools. 284 grade 2, 3, 4 pupils applied, and 212 were assigned.

On the junior high school level, 22 schools were designated "sending" schools, and 31 were selected as "receiving" schools. 393 pupils were assigned to new schools - 343 of these accepted the assignments.

With the experience of the initial programs as a guide, a city-wide program, elementary level, initiated in December 1960, brought in 3,077 applications, for transfer from "present" grades 2, 3, 4 pupils. 2,831 of these accepted the assignments made by the Central Zoning Unit for transfer in September 1961.

In the first city-wide Open Enrollment Junior High School Program, 2,669 pupils were assigned to out-of-district integrated schools.

The K-1 Pilot Program was initiated in March 1961. Out of approximately 4,000 children who were eligible, 296 children applied. 269 registered in the assigned schools the following September. This was to us an indication that the vast majority of parents were not willing to have their very young children travel by bus to an out-of-district school.

In all cases, parents were given a list of "receiving" schools, from which to select the school of their choice. In almost all cases, the Central Zoning Unit was able to assign the youngster to one of the schools selected. Sometimes, especially on the elementary level, parents were advised to revise their selection and accept other schools to which school bus transportation was possible. If, however, the parent insisted on an assignment to one of the schools selected, the child was issued a ticket or pass for public transportation use.

Since December 1961, we have planned for the transfer of 253 K-1 pupils, 1,921 grade 2, 3, 4 pupils and 1,417 sixth year pupils to integrated schools, as of September 1962 under the Open Enrollment Program.

On the high school level, we have planned to redirect minority group children, on a permissive basis, from academic high schools where the Negro and Puerto Rican population is heaviest, grouped under A below, to other schools, grouped under B below, where the "others" population is predominantly heavy.

MANHATTAN AND BRONX - "A"

%N	%P.R.	%O	
48.3	35.2	16.5	
15.2	3.0	81.0	- "B"
11.8	13.3	74.9	
15.1	3.7	81.2	
12.5	13.2	74.3	

QUEENS - "A"

29.6	1.1	69.3	
3.3	.7	96.0	- "B"
1.1	.6	98.3	
.7	.3	99.0	

BROOKLYN - "A"

%N	%P.R.	%O	
8.7	11.2	80.1	
32.4	26.1	41.5	
23.4	4.1	72.5	
10.1	7.6	82.3	
82.0	11.9	6.1	
.4	.7	98.9	- "B"
.4	.1	99.5	
.3	.2	99.5	
27.0	13.0	60.0	

This is a one year project, pending the probability of the inclusion of the high schools in the Open Enrollment Program for September 1963.

There is little doubt that the Open Enrollment Program meant extra work for the "sending" and "receiving" schools. Schools that were to receive pupils were notified far in advance as to the probable number assigned. This gave the school administration and the parents sufficient time to make the school organization adjustments that were necessary.

In the "sending" schools, letters to parents and application-for-transfer forms had to be mimeographed in Spanish and in English, and transfer lists prepared for the pilot and the full city-wide programs.

In many schools more than one meeting was held with parent groups, so that the principal could explain the open enrollment purposes and processes, and give advice on the location and travel time to selected schools. Schools worked with community groups to better inform parents of the procedures to be followed. Some community groups sponsored meetings and distributed literature explaining the program.

In the "receiving" schools, parent groups were prepared by various means for the coming of children from out-of-district. In some cases, the school officials planned joint meetings of the parents of the home school and those whose children would be arriving in September. Groups of parents who visited "receiving" schools for the purpose of making an intelligent decision as to their choice, based upon the distances to be traveled and other factors, which they had set up in their own minds as criteria, were well received.

Some school administrators, community people and parents feared that the Open Enrollment Program would have the effect of further reducing the amount of integration in schools which were already between 90% and 99% Negro and/or Puerto Rican and therefore, in effect, would be retrogression. They argued that since this program permitted any child (Negro, Puerto Rican or "others") in such a school to request a transfer to a school with a more evenly balanced pupil population, ethnically, it would in fact decrease the percentage of "others" in the "X" schools.

They felt that some restrictions should be placed upon the ethnic groups permitted to transfer.

To us, this was a calculated risk. Furthermore, we felt very strongly that all children in "X" or "Y" schools, whose parents wished them to have the opportunity of attending a school in which the ethnic population was in better balance, should have this opportunity regardless of whether they were Negro, Puerto Rican or "other". Actually, only 1.9% of those transferred under this program in September 1961 were "other", whereas 4.1% were Puerto Rican and 94% were Negro. On the junior high school level, 5.8% were "other", 8.2% were Puerto Rican and 86% were Negro.

The Open Enrollment Program has provided a new field for the thesis writers. Scores of students seized this operation for "Objective Studies". They wanted to know all about it and some of them didn't have much time. Their term papers were "due early next week". Their questions were inclusive, to say the least. Some were vague, some a bit ridiculous.

Many asked for "all the material you have on integration, desegregation, zoning and bussing of New York City public schools". Our supply of mimeographed material outlining procedures was exhausted by the requests from school administrators, individuals in other cities, and civic groups interested in learning what New York City was doing. One writer asked for a map of all boroughs with all of the school districts outlined. She did send a stamped self-addressed envelope, however.

Before the program was half under way, well-meaning people were pressing us for information on the effects of the Open Enrollment Program on the children in the "receiving" schools, and those coming from "sending" schools, the effects on their reading scores on the arithmetic levels. They asked, "How are the children received? Did they make friends? Were their parents a part of the PTA of the new schools?"

From the standpoint of integration, no one could successfully defend the position that integration resulted from the mere juxtaposing of children. But no one could argue that integration was possible without this.

Integration is a phenomena of education. It comes like all other learning. It is the result of repeated satisfying experiences. The more numerous the experiences, the deeper the learning. We do not hold that it can come only through school experiences, but we do say that a great deal can be done within the school day, if the youngster's mind is not too adversely bent by what he senses, hears or sees outside of school.

We say, too, that it takes no "objective test" for us to know that some of the children sent to "receiving" schools were below grade, some above grade, a few were doubtless disturbed children. However, the vast majority were normal children, average youngsters.

In the current Open Enrollment Program, a child who is under the care of a special school bureau (because he has an emotional problem, for example) may not be transferred to an out-of-district school without consultation with the bureau representative.

The children transferred, went toward their new experiences starched, primed and "pressed" by anxious mothers. In most cases, they were warmly received. In a few days or weeks, they became their true selves - angels or part imp, just like other children.

Some of the "receiving" school principals are certain that the "sending" school principals have gotten rid of their problem children. The "sending" school principals are just as positive that only the best children have transferred. The probability is that there is some truth in the claims of both groups of principals.

It would be untrue to say that all parent groups, teachers and administrators were equally receptive to the idea of open enrollment. Some were more enthusiastic about it than others. But the manner in which they cooperated has been extremely encouraging. The acceptance of the program in so many areas, the determination to make it work, and the preparations made in schools and communities to insure its success outweighed by far any misguided resistance.

Chairman:

I don't think there is anything that has more forcefully struck the imagination of educators and people who believe in equality and human rights, all over the United States, than the program which was administered for three years by the next speaker. He was the former coordinator of the Higher Horizons Program of the City of New York and he, himself, will tell you about that program. He is now Director of the National Education Association's Project on School Dropouts. I am pleased to present to you Mr. Daniel Schreiber.

WHAT CAN BE DONE TO REDUCE ACADEMIC RETARDATION IN MINORITY GROUP CHILDREN?

Mr. Daniel Schreiber, Director
School Dropout Project
National Education Association, Washington, D.C.

Is it any wonder that Negro parents are infuriated, angry and hostile towards a school system which has told them, "Your child is doing as well as can be expected," or "He's a bright boy; he's on the honor roll," when they later discover that their children cannot read a newspaper; or when their children begin failing after transferring to a high school outside their neighborhood; or when they cannot get a job, although they proudly possess high school diplomas.

In some sections, among some uneducated educators, these statements have an apparent ring of truth, because for them, achievement is correlated with verbal intelligence scores. As far as they are concerned, a child with a verbal intelligance score of 85 who is a year or two retarded behind his normal grade level is "doing as well as can be expected." What they forget, or are unaware of, is that the verbal intelligence scores of culturally disadvantaged children tend to get lower as they grow older.

Let me illustrate this. In New York City, the average pupil, regardless of grade, achieves an IQ score of 100. The score remains constant throughout the grades - give or take a point. However, the average Harlem child follows a dissimilar path. In grade 3, his score is a little below 100; in grade 6, it is in the low 90's; in grade 8, it is in the low 80's. The Virginia State Board of Education recently published its breakdown of intelligence quotient scores for the year 1959-60, and the comparative pattern is almost identical to that of New York. The score of the average county white child in grades 2 and 8 remains constant at 100; the score of the average county Negro child for these same two grades drops from 92 to 85.

Lest anyone jump to the conclusion that the phenomenon is peculiar to the Negro, let me assure you that this is not so. Other investigators have found this same pattern to exist elsewhere and among different ethnic groups. Dr. E. Grant Youmans found it among the eastern Kentucky mountain children. Dr. Otto Klineberg found it among the canal boat children of Holland; and Dr. Rohr found it among the American Indians. Unlike gold, it can be found wherever poor, culturally different people live.

The shame of it is that this decrement takes place during the time the child is compelled by law to be in school. If one dared be facetious about so serious a problem, one could say that the longer these children remain in school, the dumber they become. Of course, this is bosh and nonsense. The fact is, though, that the longer these children and their parents are kept out of the mainstream of our culture, the greater is their depletion.

A moment ago, I mentioned that even the proud possessors of high school diplomas cannot get jobs. Let me give one other example. In an article that appeared in the March 29, 1962 issue of REPORTER magazine, Mrs. Naomi Barko discusses the plight of the thirty-three Negro young men in a Newark high school's recent graduating class. I emphasize that they were the only Negro male graduates in that class. Five months after graduation, they were all still looking for their first job. Subsequently, they all took the Army general classification test, and not a single one passed - all failed. THEY COULDN'T EVEN READ ON A FOURTH GRADE LEVEL.

Now every parent, regardless of how ignorant or uneducated he is, expects that the school is going to teach his child how to READ. But apparently, in many instances, this isn't being done.

Perhaps it is this high correlation between verbal IQ and achievement scores that accounts for the fact that the high school dropout rate - or should we call it the squeeze-out rate - among Negroes is twice that among whites, or that the number of Negroes attending colleges in our northern states is approximately one percent of the college population.

To some extent, this was the situation in New York City in March 1956, when the sub-commission on Guidance and Educational Stimulation of the Board of Education's Commission on Integration recommended that a six year demonstration guidance project be instituted in a junior high school to identify and stimulate able students from a culturally deprived area to reach higher educational goals. A committee was chosen to visit several junior high schools, and it was an honor both to the faculty and to me, as principal, that the Manhattanville Junior High School was selected as the pilot school. The charge to us, as I saw it, was to stop the waste of precious human talent by developing a program which would raise levels of aspiration and achievement.

The main financial support came from the Board of Education,with some additional funds from the College Entrance Examination Board and the National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students. These extra funds permitted us to provide for an expanded dynamic guidance and counseling program, as well as clerical services, special instructional and remedial help, new parent education approaches, broader cultural contacts and experiences, and financial assistance to students as needed.

Although our efforts have broadened considerably since 1956, so that today the Higher Horizons program in New York City encompasses approximately 45,000 students in 65 schools at an annual cost to the Board of Education of approximately $1,500,000 above normal costs, I think I can give you more of the flavor of what we are about through a description of the pilot project, plus some further developments in the expanded program.

Manhattanville Junior High School, which had a population of approximately 1500 in 1956, is located at 129th Street and Amsterdam Avenue. It is down the hill from two great institutions of higher teaching - Columbia University and City College of New York - so that from Manhattanville, one can go in one direction only, and that is up. The ethnic and racial ratios were approximately 45% Negro, 40% Puerto Rican, 1% Orientals and the remainder - 14% - whites. At least twenty different nationalities were represented in the white group. In the case of about 50 per cent of the total population, there were no fathers present in the homes and the mothers were working, so that the teacher became the parent substitute. Special problems arose in the instances of those newly arrived from Puerto Rico, since they had to orient themselves to a new, high-pressure urban society with different cultural values. A survey of the birthplace of parents showed that less than 7 per cent of these parents were native born New Yorkers.

In addition, a study of the 1953 junior high school graduates (pre-project) indicated that approximately 40 per cent had graduated from senior high schools, as against a city wide average of 60 per cent, that less than 9 per cent had applied for admission to post-secondary schools, and that less than 4 per cent (18 out of 500) had applied for admission to four-year colleges. Subsequent studies of the pre-project classes of 1954 and 1955 showed similar results. We felt that no population group could have so many children with so few brains.

First we began by identifying the able students. The cumulative record cards of every child were studied. The entire school body was given the Stanford reading and arithmetic tests, and a non-verbal intelligence test. I should like to point out that in the past the median IQ of our school, based on group verbal tests, varied from 79 to 82. The non-verbal test produced a median score of 100 and, what is more important, a normal distribution of scores. I do not know whether this test measured the type of intelligence necessary to do academic work in college, but I do know that the score gave our teachers a tremendous lift. It is one thing to teach a class with an IQ score of 80, it is quite another thing to teach a class with a score of 100. As teachers, we expect more from our brighter children and give more of ourselves. Unfortunately, some teachers react to and teach to the IQ, although they know that verbal group test IQ scores are not, in many cases, valid for minority group children. There is a story, perhaps apocryphal, of a young teacher in the midwest who, in her desire to better help her students, studied their record cards. She noted the number 136 on one girl's record card and the number 74 on a boy's card. Whenever the girl recited correctly, she complimented her. When the girl had difficulty in answering, the teacher encouraged her by saying, "You can do this. How did you do this yesterday? What should we do next?", and so on. When the boy recited correctly he, too, was complimented. If he recited incorrectly, well, someone has to clean the blackboard, or empty the trash basket. At the end of the term, the story goes, the teacher discovered that the 136 and 74 were locker numbers.

Our prime approach was to create in the mind of the child an image of himself as a college student. This, of course, is easier said than done. How did we do it? We did it through intensive individual counseling, with both child and parent, and through dynamic group guidance lessons. (Each of three special counselors was responsible for both individual and group guidance work with one grade of approximately 250 students.) Prior to the project, our school had one counselor for 1500 students. It doesn't take too much knowledge of a school to recognize that if you have one counselor for 1500 students, most if not all, of his time will be devoted to "problem boys and girls". This meant that we had to change the image of our guidance office. Guidance counselors started by interviewing the better students first, so that the guidance office became a place where good students go. We, of course, did not ignore our "problem children", but we did place greater stress on our "unpolished diamonds".

If you were to enter our guidance office, the first thing you would notice would be the plethora of college pennants. We wanted our students to become familiar with the names of colleges - to get them thinking about colleges. College-going starts at an early age. I would hazard a guess that in the middle-class home, a child of nine or ten years of age knows that he will attend college. He may not know which college he will attend, but he knows he will go to college. If you want to experiment, ask such a child. Also in most schools in the United States, the child's decision to attend college is made in grade 8, not in grade 12. It is in that grade that the boy or girl elects to take the foreign language and algebra courses required for college admission. I know that a student may transfer from a general or vocational course to an academic course, but I'm willing to wager that less than one per cent of such students do.

During the school year, every child had at least two full interviews with his counselor and many had multiple interviews. The interviews dealt with all kinds of problems: educational,vocational, social, family, etc. Where necessary,referrals were made to social agencies, social workers and psychologists. This intensive counseling program has continued as part of the broader Higher Horizons program. It has led not only to a one-to-one relationship so important in the guidance of these children, but it gave them a feeling that here was an adult who cared, who really wanted to help them.

This individual approach was complemented by a dynamic program of group guidance. Teaching the pupils they counseled individually ensured the counselors of continuing contact with each one, and gave added insight into classroom adjustment and peer relationships. Greater stress was placed on careers and career planning. In order to show students that all avenues were open to them, counselors and students prepared achievement charts, with photographs of successful individuals of various ethnic backgrounds whose abilities had enabled them to gain recognition in their field. The captioned photographs of these new heroes and heroines were a potent stimulant to our students. Other kinds of devices were used to raise their aspirational levels. Negro and Puerto Rican professional workers were invited to address classes and assemblies. Alumni who had been successful in high school or in college were also invited. College admission officers spoke to the children at assemblies. This was played up in the community, as well, because it gives a community a tremendous lift to know that a college is interested enough in their children to send a special speaker to a junior high school.

Talking and listening about careers and college going is a good beginning, but it is not enough. Students visited colleges, research centers, and professional schools. Among the places visited were Brookhaven Atomic Energy Laboratories, Columbia College of Pharmacy, Pace College and New York University's Bellevue Research Center.

Since many of our children had little or no opportunity to participate in the cultural activities of our city, we initiated an extensive program which enabled them to learn to enjoy good music, become interested in wide reading, appreciate good theater and recognize and know fine art. A threefold learning attack was made in each activity. For example, if a group was going to see a play on Broadway, they first discussed the play with a teacher. Next they saw the play and, finally, when they came back they discussed it again. It is hard to resist or forget an experience approached in this manner.

In addition, if time permitted, the children went to a cafeteria after the show. They brought their own sandwiches and purchased beverages. We wanted them to know that all places were open to them. This was done especially after the Saturday morning concert series at Carnegie Hall. Now I know, and I'm sure you know, that New York State laws forbid discrimination in public places. It is one thing to say that a door is open. It is quite another thing to push that door open. We helped them push.

Our children were exposed to Shakespeare and Shaw, to Broadway and off-Broadway, to concerts and ballets, to symphonies and Spanish dancers, to Carnegie Hall, the Metropolitan Opera House, and to museums and movies. Wherever possible, arrangements were made to go backstage to meet the principal actors. They were especially fortunate to meet Helen Hayes, Nell Rankin and Sir John Gielgud. They took trips to Hyde Park, to the Stratford Shakespeare Theater, to West Point, and since our goal was admission to college, to colleges.

In some instances, we visited actual classrooms and laboratories and met with instructors and students; in others, mostly out-of-town colleges, we toured the campus, had lunch, saw a college football game. Our students were usually directed to the book store so that they could buy book covers. If you were to visit our school, you would see students carrying books covered by dust jackets from Yale, Princeton, Harvard, Amherst, Columbia, New York University, etc. We felt that it was good for them to be identified with a college.

No child participated in all of these activities, but all participated in some. For those in need, a special scholarship fund paid expenses, so that no pupil was deprived of a rewarding cultural experience because of lack of money. For many, the trip itself was a good experience, since they had never before traveled out of the neighborhood.

Since the understanding support of the parents was crucial to the success of the project, an all-out effort was made to acquaint the parents with the objectives of the program and the benefits that would accrue to their children from it.

A series of afternoon workshops, conducted by our counselors, were held on such topics as "Careers for Our Children", and evening meetings were set up for those who could not attend at the earlier hour. In addition, all parents were kept informed of the various activities by means of news letters in English and in Spanish. They were also invited to attend various special events and, often, to go on trips at reduced rates. Sometimes contacts were difficult to make, but every effort was made through telephone calls, letters, and visits by the counselor and social worker.

We sought to influence the parent in such things as being reasonable in assignment of home chores, in providing privacy and time for study, and in encouraging good school work. The results of our work with parents have been most heartening. Even after the graduation of their children, many parents continue to contact the counselor. They ask advice, express gratitude, and inform the counselor of their child's progress in higher school.

So far, I have dwelt on the creation of an image and the motivation to attain desirable goals. These, by themselves, are not enough. Knowledges and skills had to be acquired, achievement levels raised, and correct study habits taught, if our children were to succeed academically.

Four teachers, two to each subject, were assigned to cope with the problem of remedial reading and arithmetic. In addition to working with small groups of students, they gave demonstration lessons and trained other teachers in the use of improved techniques of teaching. Sometimes, classes limited to half the usual register were organized in English and mathematics. This permitted small group instruction for many children, with remedial help to those who needed it.

In order to provide facilities for doing homework and extend tutorial services, after school classes were set up. At each session, a teacher was available for one hour to assist students with their homework. The students could come for help or to help others. Also, the Manhattanville Community Center set up such a room for us in their evening center. This idea of a homework room in a settlement house or church is catching on throughout the country. I know that it is in operation in Louisville, Washington and San Francisco.

Since the attitude of teachers toward their students is a major ingredient in the success of an educational program, the faculty actively participated in all phases of the program. There were numerous informal and formal conferences to discuss goals, procedures and problems. Dr. Ralph Bunche recently said, as he awarded the gold key to his former fourth grade teacher, Miss Sweet, "I suddenly perceived that she believed in me and my ability, and I responded accordingly".

Since reading is the keystone of success in an academic world, a teacher training program in reading skills was initiated. This device led to increased emphasis by all teachers on reading skills, particularly in content areas. Supervised study lessons were conducted in all classes, and direct instruction was given in how to study and how to do homework. The coordination of cultural activities assisted teachers in the preparation for the planned trips and programs and in the follow-up. Teachers voluntarily accompanied students on all planned activities, even though many of them were on weekends or after school. Book Fairs were held right before Christmas and Easter, and parents were encouraged to give books as presents.

The Project has indicated that aspirational and educational levels of children can be raised if people are willing to plan for it, work for it and spend for it. Let's look at some of the results.

A study in the rate of growth of reading showed progress of 1.5 years per year. This compares favorably with their previous growth of 0.8 year per year. One group rose from a reading retardation of 1.4 years in the seventh grade to 3 months above grade level in the ninth grade. In the seventh grade, only one student out of five was on or above grade level. In the ninth grade, it was better than one out of two. The median student had a growth of 4.3 years in 2.6 years.

Our study showed that once a student is taught how to read, is encouraged to read, learns to enjoy reading, and is motivated by a desire to better himself, he will do supplementary reading on his own. This additional reading increases his understanding and improves his scholastic work.

A comparison study made between the work of 101 project graduates of 1959 and the 105 pre-project graduates of 1953, after one semester of study at the senior high school showed the following:

In 1953, five students passed all of their majors and, of these, only two had averages above 80 per cent.

In 1959, 58 students passed all of their majors, and 28 had averages above 80 per cent.

In fact, we had to add a new classification for 8 who had averages above 90 per cent.

In the first senior high school graduating class, three of our students ranked first, fourth and sixth in a senior class of 900. The first boy is a sophomore at Amherst, while the other two are sophomores at Columbia. All are scholarship students.

A comparison of the two senior high school graduating classes with the pre-project classes show that approximately 40 per cent more pupils finished high school, and that two and a half times as many went on to some post secondary education.

Comparison studies of IQ scores on verbal intelligence tests given to the different groups over a three year period indicate positive gains. Let me illustrate this with reference to the second group. There was a median individual gain of 13 points with a median gain of 17 points for boys and 11 points for girls. The boys had generally lower scores than the girls on the first test and produced greater gains.

In 1957, 26 per cent had scored in the 110 IQ category or above. In 1960, this becomes 58 per cent. Five times as many students showed gains as showed losses. Eight students had gains of more than 30 points, and two of them had gains of more than 50 points. I can assure you that a teacher looks at a boy with a different pair of eyes when he discovers that the IQ is 130 and not 80.

There has also been marked improvement in school behavior and attendance. At the junior high school, average attendance figures exceeded city wide averages.

A study done by the Bureau of Educational Research revealed that the educational and vocational goals of our children compare favorably with those of the 1955 national sample of the top thirty per cent of high school graduates.

The tremendous improvement in other areas, not so easily subjected to statistical analysis, has been certified by the results of scientific studies and by the testimony of many educators and community leaders. I can truthfully say that it has raised the ambitions of our children. It has raised their cultural levels. It has resulted in desirable changes in attitudes, interests and behavior. It has changed the thinking of parents and the community with reference to the function of education.

If one has faith in all children, and if this faith is transmitted to them, then children who in the past had little hope for a good life can now have one. Ventures such as these are expensive, but they are well worth the money. Abraham Ribicoff, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, said after visiting one of the Higher Horizons schools recently, "This is for all of America. This is the greatest single experience I have had, and the greatest single lesson I have learned".

Permit me to add a postscript about the extension of this concept. It has spread to 65 schools in New York, and next year 10 senior high schools will be added to the program. It is in operation in Philadelphia, Detroit, Washington, D.C., and San Francisco. It was the stimulus for New York State's Project Able. The Maine State Education Department is contemplating setting up a program titled, "New Horizons for Maine Youth", and the Pennsylvania Education Department has just set up a unit in education for the culturally handicapped.

The Higher Horizons concept is spreading the length and breadth of the country, because it represents a reaffirmation and an extension of our democratic faith.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Higher Education: Incentives and Obstacles, edited by Nicholas C. Brown, American Council on Education, 1960.

Daniel Schreiber, "A School's Work with Urban Disadvantaged Pupils", College Admissions 7: The Search for Talent, College Entrance Examination Board, 1960.

"The Higher Horizons Program: First Annual Progress Report, 1959-1960", Board of Education of the City of New York.

Demonstration Guidance Project:
    First Annual Progress Report, 1956-57
    Second " " " , 1957-58
    Third " " " , 1958-59
    Fourth " " " , 1959-60
    Fifth " " " , 1960-61,
        Board of Education of the City of New York.

POST SCRIPTUM

The Graduate School of Education is extremely grateful to the five distinguished symposiasts and to the large and well informed audience, whose joint participation made possible the Invitational Conference on Northern School Desegregation of April 29, 1962. Following the Conference, several references to it appeared in the daily as well as in the periodical press. In addition, many letters of thanks have been received from participants who believed that the Conference had been well worth attending and who requested copies of these Proceedings. All in all, the reactions to the Conference have reinforced our original conviction that the educational problems of segregated and culturally deprived children and parents, and the professional skills and orientations of their teachers, must receive far greater attention from the Graduate School of Education and from schools of education and educational authorities throughout the country.

Through its Project Beacon, as well as through the ongoing instructional, consultative and research work of its faculty members - particularly those in the Departments of Curriculum and Instruction, Guidance, and Special Education - The Graduate School of Education will seek to contribute to a broader understanding of the many problems in this difficult area, as well as to their solution. However, the educational problems of culturally deprived areas are so complex and their magnitude so great that one must hope that many educational institutions and agencies, public and private, professional and lay, local and national, will soon begin to work jointly in pursuing solutions to them. Certainly this is an area that requires an all-out conceptually integrated approach - an approach that is far beyond the capacity of any single educational agency or institution to provide by itself.

The Graduate School of Education stands ready to convene further conferences of teachers, administrators, educational specialists, and social or behavioral scientists interested in the educational problems of the culturally deprived areas. Some of our future conferences may be closer to the workshop format, so as to enable educators and community leaders to exchange experiences and insights concerning local problems and the pragmatically derived solutions to them. Other conferences may be closer to the seminar format so as to enable professors of sociology, psychology and education to present empirical data, and to develop social and behavioral science theory pertaining to culturally deprived groups. Our first conference was a compromise between these two extremes.

Finally, however, it must be admitted that conferences are easy to convene, while social-and-educational problems are difficult to solve. Conferences are not themselves solutions or substitutes for daily work in the community, in the classroom, in the laboratory, or with decision-makers in the school, in the community, and at various governmental levels. May our conferences continue. However, they are justified only to the extent that we can bring to them the fruits of our labors, and derive from them part of the wisdom and part of the stimulation required for further labor. It is in this respect that we hope our first Invitational Conference was justified, and it is in this spirit that we will endeavor to convene other such conferences in the years to come.

Joshua A. Fishman, Ph.D.
Dean, Graduate School of Education
Yeshiva University

June, 1962